

Reply to Office Action dated January 4, 2010

part, so as to be identical to a position and a size of the first display window and the second display window and modifying picture qualities of each of the first image part and the second image part that are to be displayed on the first display window and the second display window respectively, depending upon the control signals.

Shirata does not teach or suggest all the features of independent claim 1. More specifically, the Office Action only states that Shirata discloses a controller 71, a video processing unit 72, 62 and inherently discloses a plurality of processors for processing different parts of the divided image portions. Shirata does not teach or suggest (or inherently disclose) a video processing unit adjusting a position and a size of each of the first image part and the second image part, so as to be identical to a position and a size of the first display window and the second display window, as recited in independent claim 1. There is no teaching or suggestion that Shirata teaches these specifically claimed features.

For at least these reasons, Shirata does not teach or suggest all the features of independent claim 1. Independent claim 1 therefore defines patentable subject matter.

Independent claim 6 recites a controller outputting control signals including display information for each of a plurality of divided display windows. Independent claim 6 also recites a video processing unit adjusting either a position and a size of each of a plurality of full images that are to be displayed, or a position and a size of each of a plurality of image parts that are to be displayed, depending on the display information and converting an original image into either the plurality of full images each having a different picture quality, or the plurality of image parts

Reply to Office Action dated January 4, 2010

each having a different picture quality, depending upon the display information, and displaying the full images or the image parts on each of the display windows.

For at least similar reasons as set forth above, Shirata does not teach or suggest all the features of independent claim 6. More specifically, Shirata does not teach or suggest a video processing unit adjusting either a position and a size of each of a plurality of full images that are to be displayed, or a position and a size of each of a plurality of image parts that are to be displayed, and displaying the full images or the image parts on each of the display windows. There is no suggestion that Shirata teaches these features or inherently includes these features. Accordingly, independent claim 6 defines patentable subject matter.

Independent claim 11 recites setting up display options for a first display window and a second display window, which are divided on a screen, outputting control signals based on the display options, dividing an original image into a first image part and a second image part, and adjusting a position and a size of each of the first image part and the second image part, so as to be identical to a position and a size of each of the first display window and the second display window. Independent claim 11 also recites modifying a picture quality of each of the first image part and the second image part, so as to provide different picture qualities, wherein the first image part and the second image part are to be displayed on the first display window and the second image window, respectively.

For at least similar reasons as set forth above, Shirata does not teach or suggest all the features of independent claim 11. More specifically, Shirata does not teach or suggest adjusting a position and a size of each of the first image part and the second image part, so as to be identical

Reply to Office Action dated January 4, 2010

to a position and a size of each of the first display window and the second display window. There is no suggestion that Shirata teaches these features or inherently includes these features. Accordingly, independent claim 11 defines patentable subject matter.

Independent claim 17 recites outputting display information for a plurality of display windows, which are divided on a screen, and adjusting either a position and a size of each of a plurality of full images that are to be displayed or a position and a size of each of a plurality of image parts that are to be displayed, depending upon the display information. Independent claim 17 also recites converting an original image into either the plurality of full images each having a different picture quality, or the plurality of image parts each having a different picture quality, depending upon the display information, and displaying the full images or the image parts on each of the display windows.

For at least similar reasons as set forth above, Shirata does not teach or suggest all the features of independent claim 17. More specifically, Shirata does not teach or suggest adjusting either a position and a size of each of a plurality of full images that are to be displayed or a position and a size of each of a plurality of image parts that are to be displayed, depending upon the display information, and displaying the full images or the image parts on each of the display windows. There is no suggestion that Shirata teaches these features or inherently includes these features. Accordingly, independent claim 17 defines patentable subject matter.

For at least the reasons set forth above, each of independent claims 1, 6, 11 and 17 defines patentable subject matter. Each of the dependent claims depends from one of the independent claims and therefore defines patentable subject matter at least for this reason. In

Serial No. 10/582,522

Docket No. K-0818

Reply to Office Action dated January 4, 2010

addition, the dependent claims recite features that further and independently distinguish over the applied references.

In view of the foregoing, it is respectfully submitted that the application is in condition for allowance. Favorable consideration and prompt allowance of claims 1-3, 5-8, 10-14, 16-18 and 20-21 are earnestly solicited. If the Examiner believes that any additional changes would place the application in better condition for allowance, the Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned attorney at the telephone number listed below.

To the extent necessary, a petition for an extension of time under 37 C.F.R. 1.136 is hereby made. Please charge any shortage in fees due in connection with the filing of this, concurrent and future replies, including extension of time fees, to Deposit Account 16-0607 and please credit any excess fees to such deposit account.

Respectfully submitted,
KED & ASSOCIATES, LLP



David C. Oren
Registration No. 38,694

P.O. Box 221200
Chantilly, Virginia 20153-1200
(703) 766-3777 DCO/kah

Date: March 31, 2010

Please direct all correspondence to Customer Number 34610.